



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,654	03/21/2007	Philip Edgar Vasey	760-022	8537
34845	7590	08/18/2009		
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP			EXAMINER	
33 NAGOG PARK			STORK, KYLE R	
ACTON, MA 01720			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
08/18/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

handerson@smmalaw.com
officeadmin@smmalaw.com
cmorissette@smmalaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,654	Applicant(s) VASEY, PHILIP EDGAR
	Examiner KYLE R. STORK	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 30 June 2009.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 15, and 16 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maes et al. (EP 1100013, published 16 May 2001, hereafter Maes).

As per independent claim 1, Maes discloses a method of generating invocation sequences of update function to update elements of a form, the method comprising the steps of:

supplying update functions to a synthesizer (paragraph 0018)

identifying trigger elements from the elements of the form in the update functions that trigger the invocation of the update function (paragraphs 0018 and 0022)

generating an activation network based on the update functions at the synthesizer (paragraphs 0018, 0022, and 0108-0109)

determining the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger element (paragraphs 0018, 0022, and 0108-0109: Here, upon identifying an update function, the CML interpreter determines the CML function to be invoked to handle the update).

As per dependent claim 2, Maes discloses wherein the trigger elements are determined by at least one of the value or status of the elements of the form (paragraphs 0018 and 0022: Here, the value of the element triggers actions).

As per dependent claim 3, Maes discloses wherein the activation network includes cyclic update functions (paragraph 0018).

As per dependent claim 4, Maes discloses exporting the update functions and the invocation sequence to a form render in a readable format (paragraph 0022: Here, the data is sent to a browser in a mark-up language, so that the data may be rendered and displayed to a user in a readable format).

As per dependent claim 5, Maes discloses wherein the update function are validation function (paragraphs 0061-0064 and 0087).

As per dependent claim 6, Maes discloses wherein the update function are activation functions (paragraphs 0110-0117).

As per dependent claim 7, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer is stored on a server computer (paragraph 0017).

As per dependent claim 8, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer is stored on a client computer (paragraph 0017).

As per dependent claim 9, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer forms part of a middleware application, located between a server computer and a client computer (Figure 5a).

As per dependent claim 10, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer is integrated with the form renderer (paragraph 0022: Here, the synthesizer is incorporated with a browser, which renders the form data).

As per dependent claim 11, Maes discloses wherein the form render is a web browser application (paragraphs 0018 and 0022).

As per dependent claim 12, Maes discloses wherein the update functions are supplied by one of a database engine and a form renderer (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 13, Maes discloses wherein the step of determining the invocation sequence involves determining the order in which the update functions must be executed within the activation network (paragraphs 0110-0117).

As per dependent claim 14, Maes discloses the method further comprising:
entering data to change the status of a first form element (paragraphs 0022 and 0084: Here, the data may change a default value of a form element)
determining the position of the first form element in the activation network
(paragraphs 0022 and 0084)

triggering the update functions associated with the first form element to update the status of a second form element (paragraphs 0022 and 0084: Here, if the default value of 'yes' is changed, the value of a second form element 'travelCenter.hotel.selected' is modified by a user).

As per claim 15, the applicant discloses the limitation substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

As per claims 16-29, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1-14, respectively. Claims 16-29 are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 30 June 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's initial argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to disclose "supplying update functions to a synthesizer (page 7)." However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Maes discloses updating and synchronizing multiple user interfaces based upon a user input (paragraph 0018). This requires updating of the multiple modalities, in order for all modalities to remain synchronized. Additionally, based upon a user's response to a query, use context, and past interaction/dialog history, the subsequent queries are synthesized and synchronized (paragraph 0018). Therefore, the past interaction/dialog history is updated to include the response to the previous query. This argument is not persuasive.

The applicant's second argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to disclose identifying trigger elements from the elements of the form in the update functions that trigger the invocation of the update function (pages 7-8). This argument is based upon the belief that Maes fails to disclose update functions. As the examiner has previously explained, Maes discloses update functions (paragraph 0018). Therefore, this argument is similarly not persuasive.

The applicant's final argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to disclose "generating an activation network based on the update functions at the synthesizer" and "determining the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger element (page 8)." However, the applicant has failed to point out how the prior art fails to meet the claimed limitations. Instead, the applicant states, "Having failed to describe even the basic features associated with generating a script for customizing a standard document from an input form, Maes necessarily fails to anticipate the recited solution of generating an activation network based on the update functions at the synthesizer to determine the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger element (page 8)." Such a conclusion is not supported by the applicant's remarks, and is therefore, not persuasive.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178